

REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action of Examiner Ryan F. Pitaro, dated 29 Aug 2005.

Claims 1-2, and 4-31 are in the case, none as yet allowed.

35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-6, 11-16, 21-26, and 31 have been rejected over Celebiler, U.S. Patent 6,165,094.

Celebiler provides a splitter bar 304 which exists between panes in a window [Celebiler, col. 1, line 15; col. 2, line 2.] It is important to note what Celebiler states at col. 3, line 55-59:

"The user can also drag the splitter bar 403 to open the pane. This allows users that are used to dragging items off windows to be consistent. The choice of dragging or clicking gives the user a good shot at figuring out how to operate the mechanism."

LOT920010026US1

14

S/N 10/045,918

Thus, the splitter bar of Celebiler is not a window frame border, but rather splits panes within a window.

On the other hand, applicant's invention relates to window frame borders. [Specification, page 1, line 7.] As applicant uses the terms, a frame border is the boarder of a window, a frame contains a page, and a frameset is a collection of pages. Applicant provides in the frame border graphic and textual material which displays to the user, among other things, the direction in which the frame will expand or contract. [Specification, page 7, line 12.] The textual and graphical data in the frame border exists within and consumes space from the area occupied by the frame's content, it coexists with all other aspects of frame and frameset design and has no effect upon them. [Specification, page 8, line 19ff.]

Applicant has amended the independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 to clarify that the frame borders are window frame borders [Specification, page 1, line 7], thus distinguishing Celebiler which relates to splitter bars between panes within a window. Further, applicant has amended the certain claims to clarify that, applicant's frame border contains a graphic which, when present,

LOT920010026US1

15

S/N 10/045,918

indicates the direction in which the frame will open/close when activated. [Specification, page 7, line 12.] Further, applicant has amended certain claims to clarify that applicant's frame captioning lives within (that is, exists within) and consumes space from the area occupied by the frame's content. [Specification, page 8, line 20.]

All of the claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 11, 12, 14, 16, 21, 22, 24, 26, and 31 include limitations distinguishing Celebiler. Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 7, 8, 10, 17, 18, 20, 27, 28 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Celebiler in view of Bruce ("Bruce", Sames Teach Yourself Macromedia Dreamweaver 3, in 24 Hours).

With respect to claim 7, Bruce relates to adding a title to the frame title area. Applicant's amended claims, on the other hand, provide for including textual and graphical data selectively in all four sides of the border.

LOT920010026US1

16

S/N 10/045,918

With respect to claim 8, Bruce deals with text processor formatting alignment icons in a tool bar, these are not in any of the four sides of a frame border. Applicant's frame properties specifically relate to the frame border. Applicant allows the user to specify alignment of text within all sides of the frame border. Bruce's alignment icons are in a tool bar that governs alignment of text within a document.

Claims 10, 17, 18, 20, 27, 28 and 30 are similarly distinguished from Celebiler and Bruce.

Claims 9, 19, and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Celebiler in view of Bruce and further in view of Angiulo et al ("Angiulo", US 2002/0135621).

Angiulo is specific to the frame caption or title area, and not to all four (the other three) borders.

Again, applicant's invention relates to putting text and graphics in all four borders, and not just the frame caption. The art cited does have four borders, but all of the art speaks to the frame caption area, which is just a top border (when present).

LOT920010026US1

17

S/N 10/045,918

Applicants request that claims 9, 19, and 29 be allowed.

Correspondence Address

The Office Action to which this amendment responds was mailed to the wrong address (not the Cambridge address indicated in the original declaration). The correct address is set forth below. Applicants also submit herewith a change of address form to correct the street address in Cambridge.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants urge that the above amendments be entered and the case passed to issue with claims 1-2, 3-31.

The Application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive

LOT920010026US1

18


S/N 10/045,918

assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707.02(j) and 707.03 in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the Application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Sincerely,

M. E. Carroll

By


Shelley M. Beckstrand
Reg. No. 24,886
61 Glenmont Road
Woodlawn, VA 24381-1341

Date: 29 Dec 2005

Phone: (276) 238-1972
Fax: (276) 238-1545

Correspondence Address:

Stephen T. Keohane
Patent and Trademark Counsel
IBM Corporation, Lotus Software
One Rogers Street
Cambridge, MA 02142

LOT920010026US1

19

S/N 10/045,918